

1 Timothy R. Titolo, Esq.
2 Nevada Bar No. 003617
3 TITOLO LAW OFFICE
4 9950 West Cheyenne Ave.
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89129
6 (702) 869-5100
7 tim@titololaw.com

8
9 John D. McKay, Esq.
10 *Admitted pro hac vice*
11 PARK AVENUE LAW LLC
12 127 W. Fairbanks Ave. No. 519
13 Winter Park, Florida 32789
14 (434) 531-9569
15 johndmckayatty@gmail.com
16 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
55210
55211
55212
55213
55214
55215
55216
55217
55218
55219
55220
55221
55222
55223
55224
55225
55226
55227
55228
55229
55230
55231
55232
55233
55234
55235
55236
55237
55238
55239
55240
55241
55242
55243
55244
55245
55246
55247
55248
55249
55250
55251
55252
55253
55254
55255
55256
55257
55258
55259
55260
55261
55262
55263
55264
55265
55266
55267
55268
55269
55270
55271
55272
55273
55274
55275
55276
55277
55278
55279
55280
55281
55282
55283
55284
55285
55286
55287
55288
55289
55290
55291
55292
55293
55294
55295
55296
55297
55298
55299
552100
552101
552102
552103
552104
552105
552106
552107
552108
552109
552110
552111
552112
552113
552114
552115
552116
552117
552118
552119
552120
552121
552122
552123
552124
552125
552126
552127
552128
552129
552130
552131
552132
552133
552134
552135
552136
552137
552138
552139
552140
552141
552142
552143
552144
552145
552146
552147
552148
552149
552150
552151
552152
552153
552154
552155
552156
552157
552158
552159
552160
552161
552162
552163
552164
552165
552166
552167
552168
552169
552170
552171
552172
552173
552174
552175
552176
552177
552178
552179
552180
552181
552182
552183
552184
552185
552186
552187
552188
552189
552190
552191
552192
552193
552194
552195
552196
552197
552198
552199
552200
552201
552202
552203
552204
552205
552206
552207
552208
552209
552210
552211
552212
552213
552214
552215
552216
552217
552218
552219
552220
552221
552222
552223
552224
552225
552226
552227
552228
552229
5522210
5522211
5522212
5522213
5522214
5522215
5522216
5522217
5522218
5522219
5522220
5522221
5522222
5522223
5522224
5522225
5522226
5522227
5522228
5522229
55222210
55222211
55222212
55222213
55222214
55222215
55222216
55222217
55222218
55222219
55222220
55222221
55222222
55222223
55222224
55222225
55222226
55222227
55222228
55222229
552222210
552222211
552222212
552222213
552222214
552222215
552222216
552222217
552222218
552222219
552222220
552222221
552222222
552222223
552222224
552222225
552222226
552222227
552222228
552222229
5522222210
5522222211
5522222212
5522222213
5522222214
5522222215
5522222216
5522222217
5522222218
5522222219
5522222220
5522222221
5522222222
5522222223
5522222224
5522222225
5522222226
5522222227
5522222228
5522222229
55222222210
55222222211
55222222212
55222222213
55222222214
55222222215
55222222216
55222222217
55222222218
55222222219
55222222220
55222222221
55222222222
55222222223
55222222224
55222222225
55222222226
55222222227
55222222228
55222222229
552222222210
552222222211
552222222212
552222222213
552222222214
552222222215
552222222216
552222222217
552222222218
552222222219
552222222220
552222222221
552222222222
552222222223
552222222224
552222222225
552222222226
552222222227
552222222228
552222222229
5522222222210
5522222222211
5522222222212
5522222222213
5522222222214
5522222222215
5522222222216
5522222222217
5522222222218
5522222222219
5522222222220
5522222222221
5522222222222
5522222222223
5522222222224
5522222222225
5522222222226
5522222222227
5522222222228
5522222222229
55222222222210
55222222222211
55222222222212
55222222222213
55222222222214
55222222222215
55222222222216
55222222222217
55222222222218
55222222222219
55222222222220
55222222222221
55222222222222
55222222222223
55222222222224
55222222222225
55222222222226
55222222222227
55222222222228
55222222222229
552222222222210
552222222222211
552222222222212
552222222222213
552222222222214
552222222222215
552222222222216
552222222222217
552222222222218
552222222222219
552222222222220
552222222222221
552222222222222
552222222222223
552222222222224
552222222222225
552222222222226
552222222222227
552222222222228
552222222222229
5522222222222210
5522222222222211
5522222222222212
5522222222222213
5522222222222214
5522222222222215
5522222222222216
5522222222222217
5522222222222218
5522222222222219
5522222222222220
5522222222222221
5522222222222222
5522222222222223
5522222222222224
5522222222222225
5522222222222226
5522222222222227
5522222222222228
5522222222222229
55222222222222210
55222222222222211
55222222222222212
55222222222222213
55222222222222214
55222222222222215
55222222222222216
55222222222222217
55222222222222218
55222222222222219
55222222222222220
55222222222222221
55222222222222222
55222222222222223
55222222222222224
55222222222222225
55222222222222226
55222222222222227
55222222222222228
55222222222222229
552222222222222210
552222222222222211
552222222222222212
552222222222222213
552222222222222214
552222222222222215
552222222222222216
552222222222222217
552222222222222218
552222222222222219
552222222222222220
552222222222222221
552222222222222222
552222222222222223
552222222222222224
552222222222222225
552222222222222226
552222222222222227
552222222222222228
552222222222222229
5522222222222222210
5522222222222222211
5522222222222222212
5522222222222222213
5522222222222222214
5522222222222222215
5522222222222222216
5522222222222222217
5522222222222222218
5522222222222222219
5522222222222222220
5522222222222222221
5522222222222222222
5522222222222222223
5522222222222222224
5522222222222222225
5522222222222222226
5522222222222222227
5522222222222222228
5522222222222222229
55222222222222222210
55222222222222222211
55222222222222222212
55222222222222222213
55222222222222222214
55222222222222222215
55222222222222222216
55222222222222222217
55222222222222222218
55222222222222222219
55222222222222222220
55222222222222222221
55222222222222222222
55222222222222222223
55222222222222222224
55222222222222222225
55222222222222222226
55222222222222222227
55222222222222222228
55222222222222222229
552222222222222222210
552222222222222222211
552222222222222222212
552222222222222222213
552222222222222222214
552222222222222222215
552222222222222222216
552222222222222222217
552222222222222222218
552222222222222222219
552222222222222222220
552222222222222222221
552222222222222222222
552222222222222222223
552222222222222222224
552222222222222222225
552222222222222222226
552222222222222222227
552222222222222222228
552222222222222222229
5522222222222222222210
5522222222222222222211
5522222222222222222212
5522222222222222222213
5522222222222222222214
5522222222222222222215
5522222222222222222216
5522222222222222222217
5522222222222222222218
5522222222222222222219
5522222222222222222220
5522222222222222222221
5522222222222222222222
5522222222222222222223
5522222222222222222224
5522222222222222222225
5522222222222222222226
5522222222222222222227
5522222222222222222228
5522222222222222222229
55222222222222222222210
55222222222222222222211
55222222222222222222212
55222222222222222222213
55222222222222222222214
55222222222222222222215
55222222222222222222216
55222222222222222222217
55222222222222222222218
55222222222222222222219
55222222222222222222220
55222222222222222222221
55222222222222222222222
55222222222222222222223
55222222222222222222224
55222222222222222222225
55222222222222222222226
55222222222222222222227
55222222222222222222228
55222222222222222222229
552222222222222222222210
552222222222222222222211
552222222222222222222212
552222222222222222222213
552222222222222222222214
552222222222222222222215
552222222222222222222216
552222222222222222222217
552222222222222222222218
552222222222222222222219
552222222222222222222220
552222222222222222222221
552222222222222222222222
552222222222222222222223
552222222222222222222224
552222222222222222222225
552222222222222222222226
552222222222222222222227
552222222222222222222228
552222222222222222222229
5522222222222222222222210
5522222222222222222222211
5522222222222222222222212
5522222222222222222222213
5522222222222222222222214
5522222222222222222222215
5522222222222222222222216
5522222222222222222222217
5522222222222222222222218
5522222222222222222222219
5522222222222222222222220
55

1 This Motion for Sanctions is about the responsibility that Frontier must face for its repeated,
 2 flagrant and still continuing abuses of the discovery process in this case during the past two years, not
 3 about whether Plaintiffs' counsel has impugned the character of Frontier's counsel. However, for the
 4 record (and as clearly evident *in* the record), Plaintiffs' counsel has never once assailed in any
 5 manner the professionalism or character of the attorneys representing Frontier. Sadly, Frontier's
 6 Response provides abundant evidence that a reciprocal observation cannot now be made about its
 7 counsel. With its Response, Frontier moves from an ineffective strategy of "blame the victims," *see*
 8 ECF No. 135 at 3-4, to an equally ineffective strategy of "attack the victims and their attorney." Its
 9 counsel use two valid observations about *Frontier's* choice of authorities and its behaviors in
 10 response to Plaintiffs' discovery requests as a springboard to launch an unrestrained and
 11 unprecedented attack on both Plaintiffs and their counsel:
 12

Plaintiffs' Motion (ECF No. 141)	Frontier's Response (ECF No. 145)
"[Frontier] claimed that federal law authorized its redactions, citing as support for that proposition a district court opinion that anyone capable of reading a regulation in the English language could see was erroneously decided." Motion p. 6-7	"exaggerated," Response p. 2 "wildly inappropriate," <i>id.</i> "frivolous," <i>id.</i> "full of malicious insults unbecoming of this tribunal," <i>id.</i> "proclivity for hyperbole on full display," <i>id.</i>
"To conclude from these facts that Frontier lacks all semblance of shame would be an understatement." <i>Id.</i> , at 15	"Plaintiffs bloviate," <i>id.</i> "uncivil accusations," <i>id.</i> "vicious barbs," <i>id.</i> "crosses the line," <i>id.</i> "devoid of any thoughtful legal analysis and seems intended only to attack the character of Frontier's counsel," <i>id.</i> "frivolity," <i>id.</i> at 5 "Undeterred by reality," <i>id.</i> at 6 "false narrative," <i>id.</i>

1	“conspiracy theory,” <i>id.</i>
2	“wandering complaints . . . [that] are hard
3	to fathom,” <i>id.</i> at 7
4	“absurd,” <i>id.</i> at 8, n.1
5	“hysterics,” <i>Id.</i> at 10
6	“inappropriate and unprofessional swipe,”
7	<i>id.</i>
8	“Plaintiffs . . . bemoan,” <i>id.</i> at 11
9	“not the first time Plaintiffs have
10	disrespected a court,” <i>id.</i> at 13
11	“sniped,” <i>id.</i>
12	“Plaintiffs’ counsel is clearly prone to
13	lashing out at lawyers and judges with
14	whom he disagrees,” <i>id.</i> at 14
15	“neither professional nor civil,” <i>id.</i>

To borrow a line from Shakespeare, “The lady doth protest too much, methinks.”¹ Underneath its unsupportable attacks, Frontier admits that it has not yet fully complied with a document production that the Court ordered it to make on May 8, 2020, over 16 months ago, and ordered again in a slightly expanded form on March 29, 2021, nearly 8 months ago. *See, Resp.* at 2 (“production is *nearly* complete.” Emphasis added). It also concedes that the documents it has produced to date have been truncated by redactions that the Court did not authorize it to make. In response to this Motion, Frontier needed to provide the Court with some legitimate legal explanation for its disobedience of the Court’s Orders that was beyond its ability to control, but it utterly failed to provide any such explanation. Attacking Plaintiffs and their attorney does not provide a valid substitute for the explanation that it bore the burden of providing. *See, Jorgensen v. Cassiday*, 320 F.3d 906, 912 (9th Cir. 2003)(party accused of willful misconduct bears the sole burden of showing how the disobedient conduct resulted from circumstances outside of its control).

¹ *Hamlet*, Act III, Scene II.

1 **II. Frontier has deliberately chosen to subvert the normal discovery process, and it**
 2 **has not even attempted to provide the Court with justification for its conduct.**

3 Frontier produced the first redacted set of records of discrimination complaints responsive to
 4 Request No. 47 of Plaintiffs' First Request for Production on July 30, 2021, which was well over a
 5 year and a half past the date the responses should have been due pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P.
 6 34(b)(2)(A), and 14 months after the Court ordered production of responsive documents.² But that
 7 turned out to be just the beginning of a slow drip of responsive documents that Frontier has now
 8 stretched out over four more months, with production always timed for a Friday release date, and
 9 which it asserts is not yet complete ("its ongoing production efforts are nearly complete," Resp. at 6).
 10 Plus, it has redacted identifying and contact information from all of the documents that it has
 11 produced, despite the fact that the Court's Orders contained no authorization to redact information
 12 from them. As noted in Plaintiffs' Motion, prior leave of Court is normally required before redacting
 13 information from a document in litigation, *see, e.g., Bartech Int'l, Inc. v. Mobile Simple Solutions,*
 14 *Inc.*, Case No. 2:15-cv-02422-MMD-NJK (D. Nev., April 27, 2016); *Terry v. Register Tapes*
 15 *Unlimited, Inc.*, Case No. 2:16-cv-00806-WBS-AC (E.D. Cal., June 29, 2018). Without the names
 16 and contact information, Plaintiffs are unable to obtain details of the complainants' sides of the
 17 relevant facts (many of the reports have been written by the Frontier employees who received the
 18 complaints and/or contain only the flight attendants' versions of what happened), or even what
 19 protected class several of the complainants belong to (many reports state that the passenger felt he or
 20 or
 21 or
 22 or
 23 or
 24 or
 25 or
 26 or
 27 or
 28 or

² Plaintiffs served their First Request for Production on Frontier on October 7, 2019, and it produced no documents in response. The Court granted Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel on May 8, 2020. Frontier produced its first set of responsive documents in heavily redacted form on Friday, July 16, 2021. It produced the next set, also heavily redacted, on Friday, September 17, 2021, exactly seven weeks later. It produced the third set of heavily redacted documents the following Friday, September 24, 2021. It delayed the next production until Friday, November 12, 2021, precisely seven weeks after the previous production. It recently claimed to be "nearly" finished with this obviously scheduled release of responsive documents. Its reasons for the delayed releases, the Friday release dates, what remains to be produced and when the dribbling production will end, remain entirely opaque. It is impossible to conclude that this conduct is benign or based on a good faith willingness to comply with the Court's production Orders.

1 she was discriminated against due to “race” but fail to identify what race). Frontier’s unauthorized
 2 redactions render the documents nearly useless.³

3 In the face of this clear record of its obviously calculated obstruction of the discovery process,
 4 defiance of the Court’s Orders and unilateral decisions to redact information on “privacy” grounds
 5 that it never even raised in its objections, Frontier offers *zero* factual explanation to justify its
 6 conduct. Instead, it: (1) makes the wholly unsupported claim that “there is no basis to impose even
 7 minor sanctions” against it, Resp. at 3; (2) falsely argues that the requested sanctions are “*case-*
 8 *dispositive*” (italics in original) and would therefore violate due process, *id.*;⁴ (3) makes irrelevant
 9 arguments concerning the merits of the case, *id.* at 4; (4) reasserts a demonstrably false claim that
 10 “Plaintiffs expressed no concerns or allegations of unwarranted delay until after the parties filed their
 11 fifth stipulated motion to extend discovery deadlines,” knowing that its counsel deleted an expression
 12 of that very concern from that document prior to filing it, *see* Reply on Motion for Sanctions, ECF
 13 No. 135 at 4-6 and Exhibit A, ECF 135-1; (5) argues the number of pages of documents that it has
 14 produced (without explaining why the production of those relating to prior claims of human
 15 trafficking and discrimination complaints against it was delayed for more than a year after the Court
 16 ordered it to produce them, or providing a valid basis for redacting the names and contact information
 17 of all of the passengers involved), *id.* at 5; (6) makes irrelevant references to documents that have
 18 nothing to do with Orders to compel at issue, *id.*;⁵ (7) claims that its conduct in defiance of the
 19

20 ³ Frontier makes a misleading claim that Plaintiffs “took a contrary position” in their prior Motion for Sanctions, *see*
 21 Response at 9. They did not—some of the reports of suspected human trafficking do reveal a pattern of racial profiling
 22 and false reports, as Plaintiffs said in that Motion, but several other reports contain incomplete descriptions of the facts.
 23 The complaints of race and ethnicity discrimination are even more incomplete. Further investigation, through contacting
 24 the complaining parties, is necessary to determine all of the relevant facts.

25 ⁴ The requested default sanction would be dispositive of only one of seven counts of the currently operative Second
 26 Amended Complaint.

27 ⁵ The documents at issue concern prior complaints of racial and ethnic discrimination and reported instances of suspected
 28 human trafficking, which are evidence of Frontier fostering an environment leading up to the date of Plaintiffs’ flight in
 which its flight attendants were commended for making baseless allegations of human trafficking against passengers
 based on their looks and in which complaints of racial and ethnic discrimination were routinely swept under the rug year
 after year. That evidence is relevant and fundamental to Plaintiffs’ allegations that Frontier had corporate complicity in

1 Court's Orders could have been even worse, *id.* at 5-7; (8) claims that Plaintiffs have suffered no
 2 prejudice by the delays and redactions because they "do not need the redacted information," *id.* at 9;
 3 (9) continues to tout the significance of district court decisions that were obviously made in error
 4 because they go against the plain language of the regulation that they claim to be upholding (Frontier
 5 avoids any comparison of the holdings to the actual language of the regulation, despite the
 6 inescapable axiom that the plain language of a regulation is the best evidence of its meaning, *see*
 7 *Inland Empire Public Lands Council v. U.S. Forest Service*, 88 F.3d 754, 761 (9th Cir. 1996) and
 8 *Idaho First Nat'l Bank v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 997 F.2d 1285, 1289 (9th Cir.1993)),
 9 Resp. at 10-13; (10) presents a blatantly false claim that "[t]he parties have been unable to reach a
 10 resolution regarding the redacted information in this case because Plaintiffs have failed to show any
 11 connection between their allegations and the unrelated flights such that would warrant contacting the
 12 individuals involved," *id.* at 12 (no such discussion has ever occurred); (11) makes a factually
 13 unsupported—and unsupportable—argument that less drastic sanctions could suffice, *id.* at 13; and
 14 (12) invents nonexistent rules of federal law to support its conduct, as noted below, *see id.* at 2-3. The
 15 obvious conclusion from those arguments in Frontier's response is that it has no interest in explaining
 16 or attempting to justify its conduct based on circumstances beyond its control. Again, Ninth Circuit
 17 jurisprudence places the burden of identifying such circumstances squarely on Frontier's shoulders.
 18
 19 As the Ninth Circuit stated in *Jorgensen*:

20 Where the sanction results in default, the sanctioned party's violations must be due to
 21 the "willfulness, bad faith, or fault" of the party. *Hyde & Drath v. Baker*, 24 F.3d 1162,
 22 1167 (9th Cir.1994) (citing *Fjelstad v. Am. Honda Motor Co.*, 762 F.2d 1334, 1341 (9th
 23 Cir.1985)). "Disobedient conduct not shown to be outside the control of the litigant is

24
 25
 26 conduct that violates §1981. The Court ordered Frontier to produce those documents. Plaintiffs' Motion does not concern
 27 documents designated as SSI, FBI investigative documents, LVMPD investigative documents, Plaintiff A.D.'s middle
 28 school records, or Plaintiffs' medical records. None of those documents were the subject of the Court's production
 Orders. Frontier's arguments concerning the latter types of documents amount to nothing more than a red herring
 intended to deflect the Court's focus from the actual issue of its disobedience of the Court's Orders.

1 sufficient to demonstrate willfulness, bad faith, or fault." *Hyde & Drath*, 24 F.3d at
 2 1166.

3 320 F.3d, at 912. Thus, by failing to identify any reason why failing to produce the documents
 4 immediately after the Court's production Order and redacting information that the Order did not
 5 authorize it to remove was somehow due to factors outside of its control, Frontier has demonstrated
 6 the "willfulness, bad faith, or fault" necessary to impose the sanction of default on Count One. *Id.*

7 **III. Frontier fails to address the central legal argument concerning 14 C.F.R. §243.9,**
 8 **preferring instead to invent a rule of law that does not exist.**

9 In its weak attempt to support its redaction decisions with legal precedent, Frontier
 10 demonstrates anew its penchant for inventing rules of law to support its violations of the Court's
 11 Orders. It claims in its Response:

12 However, federal courts applying a federal regulation establish that airlines must protect
 13 the identities of passengers absent an order expressly prohibiting redactions. No such
 14 order has been entered in this case. Thus, to maintain compliance with this Court's Order
 15 and also with federal law, in producing its responsive documents, Frontier has redacted
 personal information identifying the individuals involved with the unrelated flights.

16 *Id.* at 2. It cites no case authority for that proposition, because there is no case holding that "airlines
 17 must protect the identities of passengers absent an order expressly prohibiting redactions." It repeats
 18 that invalid claim again on the following page, again without any citation to authority: "Absent a
 19 Court Order expressly prohibiting redactions, legitimate privacy concerns and compliance with
 20 federal law support Frontier's decision to protect the identities of those involved with the unrelated
 21 incidents." *Id.*, at 3. In doing so, Frontier audaciously invents from whole cloth a federal rule of law
 22 that redaction of passengers' names is considered the norm by federal courts, unless forbidden by "an
 23 order expressly prohibiting redactions." Not even the wrongly decided district court opinion in
 24 *Wallman v. Tower Air Inc.*, 189 F.R.D. 566 (N.D. Cal. 1999), and its progeny of equally erroneous
 25 decisions from other district courts and one state appellate court, *see* discussion in Plaintiffs' original
 26 Motion for Sanctions, ECF No. 128 at 16-20 (herein incorporated by reference), contain any language
 27
 28

1 remotely similar to the “rule” claimed by Frontier. Frontier simply made it up. That is a clear
 2 example of Frontier purposefully misleading the Court, which is an additional ground for the
 3 imposition of sanctions. *See, e.g., Roberts v. American Energy Resources, Inc.*, 942 F.2d 793 (9th Cir.
 4 1991); *Montgomery v. City of Ardmore*, 365 F.3d 926, 943 (10th Cir. 2004); *United States v. King*,
 5 478 F.2d 494, 504 (9th Cir. 1973)(“We cannot describe as ‘good faith’ an apparently deliberate
 6 attempt to mislead the court.”).

7 Frontier wholly avoids the central and obvious issue concerning 14 C.F.R. §243.9, which is
 8 whether the language of the regulation supports its redactions. As noted in the discussion in
 9 Plaintiffs’ prior Motion for Sanctions, Part 243 of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations as a
 10 whole applies only to “covered flight segments,” *see* §243.1, and a “covered flight segment” is
 11 defined in §243.3 as: “a passenger-carrying flight segment operating to or from the United States . . .
 12 [which] does not include a flight segment in which both the point of departure and point of arrival are
 13 in the United States.” In other words, Part 243 applies only to international, rather than domestic,
 14 flights, for the reasons explained in detail in Plaintiffs’ previously filed Motion for Sanctions (ECF
 15 No. 128). *Wallman* concerned a domestic flight—from JFK to SFO—and therefore the Northern
 16 District [of California] Court’s application of Part 243 to the flight’s passengers was erroneous from
 17 the outset. Moreover, the only confidentiality provision in Part 243 is §243.9(c), which by its plain
 18 language applies solely to “the contact information collected pursuant to section 243.7(a)(2).” The
 19 latter subsection authorizes the solicitation of emergency contact information from passengers, which
 20 they are not required by law to provide to the airlines. Section 243.3 defines such a contact as “a
 21 person not on the covered flight or an entity that should be contacted in case of an aviation disaster.”
 22 The flights depicted in the documents produced by Frontier are all domestic flights, because the
 23 Court’s Order of May 8, 2020 limited production to flights in “the continental United States,” *see*
 24

1 ECF No. 83 at 4. The names and contact information that Frontier has redacted from the documents
 2 are those of passengers aboard the flights in question, so they could not be the “contacts” protected
 3 by the confidentiality provision of §243.9(c) even if the flights had been international ones. A person
 4 cannot logically be a “passenger” (defined by §243.3 as a “person aboard a covered flight segment”)
 5 and, at the same time, a “contact” (defined by §243.3 as a “person not on the covered flight”). A
 6 simple reading of the plain language of Part 243 establishes that it applies to neither the flights
 7 described in the documents produced by Frontier nor to the names of the passengers and their contact
 8 information. “It is a fundamental canon that where the statutory text is plain and unambiguous, a
 9 court must apply the statute according to its terms.” *Salisbury v. City of Santa Monica*, 994 F.3d
 10 1056, 1062 (9th Cir. 2021)(internal citations omitted). Under the holding of *Salisbury*, courts are
 11 *unauthorized* to engage in interpretation beyond such language. *Id.* at 1062-63.

14 There can be little doubt that the airlines have appreciated the benefit of the erroneous
 15 decision in *Wallman*, and they and their defense counsel have continued to cite it when doing so
 16 serves their interests. They have succeeded in convincing six more district judges and a state
 17 appellate court panel to follow it. But as shown above and in Plaintiffs’ previous Motion for
 18 Sanctions, their holdings fly in the face of the regulation’s plain language and therefore should not be
 19 followed. It is worth noting that Frontier primarily relies on a case in which United Airlines
 20 convinced a district judge in the Central District of California to follow the *Wallman* decision, *Anders*
 21 *v. United Airlines, Inc.*, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 250250 (C.D. Cal., December 18, 2020),⁶ while
 22 another large airline, American Airlines, had no qualms about voluntarily providing 1.2 million of its
 23 former passengers’ names and contact information to a third-party vendor in the circumstances
 24

27
 28 ⁶ Although the decision did not cite *Wallman* as support for the court’s holding, *Wallman* was the sole case that United
 cited in support of its objections to producing the documents, as reflected in a stipulated motion filed with the court, *see*
 Case No. CV 19-5809-GW (KS) (C.D. Calif.) at ECF No. 52, pp. 5-6 (excerpt attached as **Exhibit A** hereto).

1 litigated in *In re American Airlines Privacy Litigation*, 370 F. Supp. 2d 552 (N.D. Tex. 2005). The
 2 district court in the Texas multidistrict litigation found absolutely no legal basis to hold American
 3 liable for releasing the passengers' information without their consent, and the court made no mention
 4 of 14 C.F.R. §243.9, the regulation cited by Frontier in the instant case, despite the fact that the
 5 regulation had been on the books for several years prior to American's disclosure of the names and
 6 contact information.

8 It is also worth noting that Frontier avoids any discussion of the actual language of Part 243 in
 9 its responses to this Motion and the previous Motion for Sanctions, which leads inescapably to the
 10 conclusion that it is fully cognizant of the mismatch between the language of the regulation and the
 11 erroneous holding of *Anders* (which can be traced back to the erroneous holding of *Wallman*, *see n.6*
 12 below). This also amounts to willful misleading of the Court on a critical issue.

14 Finally as to this issue, Frontier states on page 10 of its Response: "Frontier was hopeful that,
 15 if Plaintiffs felt the production of unredacted documents was required, they would simply file a
 16 motion to compel them . . ." Plaintiffs *did* file, and *won*, a motion to compel production of the prior
 17 complaints and descriptions of prior instances of human trafficking accusations. Frontier never raised
 18 any objections in its response to the requests for production or its briefing of that motion to the
 19 production based on its alleged privacy concerns on behalf of "unsuspecting and potentially
 20 vulnerable individuals," *see id.* at 13, thus waiving any such objections entirely. *Richmark Corp. v.*
 21 *Timber Falling Consultants*, 959 F.2d 1468, 1473 (9th Cir. 1992); *see also Haddad v. Interstate*
 22 *Management Co., LLC*, 2012 WL 398764, * 1 (D. Nev. 2012) (same); 7 James Wm. Moore et al.,
 23 MOORE'S FEDERAL PRACTICE, § 33.174[2], at 33-106, §34.13[2][a], at 34-56 to 34-56.1 (3d ed. 2012).
 24 This Court ordered it to produce the documents, and included no authorization for redactions.
 25 Frontier delayed production for more than a year, in disobedience of that Order, and then scrubbed
 26

1 the documents of certain pertinent information, in further disobedience of the Order. Plaintiffs should
 2 not have to file yet another motion to compel. Instead, Frontier should bear the consequences of its
 3 willful disobedience of the Court's Orders by the entry of its default on Count One.

4 **IV. Frontier's allegation that Plaintiffs' counsel has "disrespected the Court" is**
 5 **baseless.**

6 Frontier's suggestion that Plaintiffs' lead counsel (McKay) has disrespected the Court is
 7 baseless. It appears to be based entirely on his previously noting, truthfully, that he had spent hours
 8 trying to determine what the former Magistrate Judge assigned to this case found wanting in
 9 Plaintiffs' first two motions to compel. His statements on that subject conveyed no disrespect; they
 10 simply inquired why a format for a motion to compel that had successfully reached decisions on the
 11 merits in several other federal courts was being rejected in this one. He has the utmost respect for
 12 state and federal judges. He previously served two terms on a disciplinary committee of the Virginia
 13 State Bar, and on the Professionalism Committee of the Charlottesville-Albemarle (Virginia) Bar
 14 Association, both of which heard and decided complaints of attorney misconduct and/or lapses in
 15 professionalism. He was one of the original founders, along with a sitting federal judge, of the
 16 Thomas Jefferson Inn of Court, originally organized under the auspices of the American Inns of
 17 Court Foundation, the purpose of which was to teach professionalism to young litigators. Frontier's
 18 claim that he is "clearly prone to lashing out at lawyers and judges with whom he disagrees," Resp. at
 19 14, is unfounded and not well received. There is a tangible connection between the increasing
 20 sharpness of Frontier's rhetoric and its facing possible consequences for subverting the discovery
 21 process for its own ends. But that is entirely the point—the Rules of Civil Procedure and the Court
 22 control the pace and progress of litigation, and the content of what is produced, not Frontier.
 23

24 **V. Default sanctions are justified by Frontier's conduct.**

1 Plaintiffs initially thought that a finding of fact and/or an Order requiring Frontier to remove
 2 the redactions might sufficiently address the consequences of its misconduct. It is now clear,
 3 however, that such sanctions—or any other sanctions less severe than a default as to Count One—
 4 cannot adequately and properly address the severe prejudice caused by Frontier’s disobedience.
 5 Plaintiffs *still* cannot conduct depositions with a full set of documents. Plaintiffs *still* cannot discover
 6 the full facts behind the prior discrimination complaints. Plaintiffs *still* do not know when Frontier
 7 will complete the production it was ordered to complete over a year ago. Frontier *still* has not
 8 provided alternative dates for its deposition after declaring that it refuses to appear on the dates
 9 noticed. The clock is ticking on the discovery period, and Frontier knows that. Its conduct is designed
 10 to run out that clock. At this point, there is little possibility that Plaintiffs could contact the prior
 11 discrimination complainants and schedule depositions in the time left. Expert reports are due in late
 12 March, and Plaintiffs’ expert on race discrimination could not possibly prepare opinions based on the
 13 details of the past complaints between some unknown future date when Frontier finally discloses
 14 those details and late March. Frontier’s misconduct has resulted in the loss of more than 16 months
 15 during which meaningful discovery could have been conducted if it had not disobeyed the production
 16 Orders. It must now face the consequences of its prejudicial conduct.

17 DATED this 23rd day of September, 2021.

18
 19 /s/ John D. McKay
 20 John D. McKay (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 21 PARK AVENUE LAW LLC
 22 127 W. Fairbanks Ave., No. 519
 23 Winter Park, FL 32789
 24 johndmckayatty@gmail.com
 (434) 531-9569

25 Timothy R. Titolo (Nev. Bar. No. 3617)
 26 TITOLO LAW OFFICE
 27 9950 West Cheyenne Avenue
 28 Las Vegas, Nevada 89129
 (702) 869-5100
 tim@titololaw.com
Attorneys for Plaintiffs